10/4/77

Dear Bryson,

Yesterday I redeived a call from a friend who is acting as a consultant to a foreign TV network (English labguage) with the request that I use my good offices to arrange for them to interview Skip. I said I would not disclose how he could be reached or where he is but upon getting some assurances of the manner in which he would be treated would relay the request.

Today the producer phoned me. I told him I could make no guarantees but would not forward a request without the guarantee that there would be ground rules to which Hall's lawyer would have to agree, which really means specify. While I believe there is probably little you would want to preclude one thing would be that they would not go into areas to which Hall, under your guidance, would have to be refusing to respond. It is a very simple matter for interviewers to make the interviewee look very bad.

Skip might welcome the challenge of a Mike Wallace type thing but it could ruin him forever - and I think CBS might well enjoy it.

These people are deep into a show for which they have already done much research. They are going to do it whether or not they have Skip on film. If they do not have him he may not look very good and may look very bad as a result of others they will have, like Hemming. I know there has been that contact. This is only one of the reasons I suggest you give this serious thought and let me know. If my belief means anything to you my belief is that Hall should do it. Among the side considerations is that these people have a tape of the foolish things Hall said to Weberman, who taped it. Entirely confidentially I also have that tape and Skip should have listened to his wife and said nothing. What he did say can hurt him much. Weberman can be interviewed and he can repeat exactly what Skip then said. Among the positive reasons is that he can help himself if he can be more like he was with Lardner, with a little less profanity, rather than as with Weberman.

Although this is foreign there will be some domestic backlash at least. This can help you when it becomes clear that the reason there was no testimony in June is because there was prejudice and there was no protection. On this I could lead them to see that Skip then was quite willing to respond under the proper conditions and that the very day he spoke very openly with a reporter who assured confidence and has preserved it.

We can discuss this more if you'd like. You may want to ask Art's opinion. He knows the medium and is an experienced reporter. I'd be willing to be present and to assist as well as caution Whatever you decide, there is the actuality that as an alternative they can always use prior printed interviews.

They are interested in the Mafia and the JFK assassination and Cuban angles. They are interested in Ruby in the mob sense. They have a source other than the nut Hudson was says that Ruby visited Santos in the quonsethut. And they will be shooting the middle of this month or later. I'll hear from them probably about or just before the 15th. I do not believe the Hudson story and have told them this. Their consultant has spent much of the past two years interviewing various mafia figures, including some not spearcarriers. If you decide to do this I suggest you ask Art for what he thinks may be asked and what you should want aired in addition to what you both think. By now you know what you can expect of me by way of getting the truth told and heard.

I think your client can stand some good public relations, whether it is aired before of after the committee hears him. If you want I can make suggestions. One I would urge is an informal environment such as we had with Lardner and dependence upon adherence to the ground rules if there is deviation. Under these conditions Skip can project himself pretty well and still be projected against such things as his natural language.

And I would still like my pictures returned. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg